Augmentation of CEDEN

Karl c Jacobs

Public Comments

No public comments were received for this proposal.

Collaboration Panel Review

Proposal Title

#0264: Augmentation of CEDEN

Final Panel Rating
adequate

Collaboration Panel (Primary) Review

Collaboration:

Will the results of the collaborative effort be greater than the sum of its parts? Is it clear why the subprojects are part of a larger collaborative proposal rather than several independent smaller ones?

```
adequate
Collaboration involves integration of new information into
existing databases to provide wider access to researchers. It
is clear that the collaboration is a larger result of the
completed project. Collaboration within the project is less
focused and organized. "The benefits described in this grant
include the gross improvement in the flow of data and
information between the tributaries located in the Sacramento
River watershed, the integrated networks described in this
proposal and DSS that turn data into information.
Consolidation of the various and diverse environmental data
sets within the state, and local management of these data sets
will be improved. In addition, operational costs will be
minimized by using an existing data management infrastructure
and existing application software that will be made available
for data users."
```

Interdependence And Integration:

Does the proposal have an example that clearly articulates the conceptual model of each subproject and how they link together as a whole? Are the boundaries of the study plans focused and cohesive, yet well delineated? Is there a plan for potential differences in the stages of subproject completion times? Are there clear plans for analyses and interpretations

which seek to identify and quantify relationships among the data collected in various subprojects rather than separate analyses for each subproject?

inadequate
Explanations are lengthy, but the existing work is adequately described, as well as how new work will add to it. No plan for completion time differences are identified (yet its highly likely they will occur with this type of project). No analysis or interpretations are mentioned.

Project Management:

Is it clear who will be performing management tasks and administration of the project? Are there resources set aside for project management and time given for investigators to collaborate? Is there a process for making decisions during the course of the project? Are there acknowledgments of potential barriers to collaboration and explanations of how team members will overcome barriers particular to their institutions?

inadequate
Two people are identified as providing project oversight at a very high level, but not much detail about how they are going to accomplish it. Much training is involved. Some meetings are planned. It seems like a very large and detailed project that depends on individuals knowing what is required and acting independently.

Team Composition:

Does the lead principal investigator have successful management history and experience leading collaborative teams? Is it clear that all key personnel are committed to making significant contributions to the project? Do team members have complementary skills?

inadequate
I cannot evaluate whether skills are complementary based on what is given. Each individual is required to perform at a high level (provide training through workshops, provide information to watershed groups, provide technical support to 2 organizations, etc.)

Communication Of Results:

Is there a clear plan for comprehensive and cohesive reporting of project progress to the CALFED community?

`inadequate`
`"Progress reports as required" isn't much of a plan.`

Additional Comments:

Collaboration Panel (Discussion) Review

`Both reviewers judged this proposal as Adequate. The secondary`
`reviewer noted a detailed list of deliverables that highlights`
`communications of results. The team has a proven track record`
`of working together, collaborating with outside groups, and of`
`producing excellent results.`

Technical Synthesis Panel Review

Proposal Title

#0264: Augmentation of CEDEN

Final Panel Rating
adequate

Technical Synthesis Panel (Primary) Review

TSP Primary Reviewer's Evaluation Summary And Rating:

The integration of environmental monitoring data and making such integrated data available is very important for the efficient use of the monitoring data collected by various agencies and groups. While the relationship between BDAT, SWAMP and CERES is spelled out, it is unclear why there is a need for an augmented CEDEN. Is CEDEN just getting set-up (as indicated by the $750K region 9 EPA grant entitled "CEDEN EPA Exchange Network Grant" that is just getting underway) or is that a grant for another modification to CEDEN? (If so, that is not clear) If CEDEN is just getting underway, is it not premature to augment this program? If the EPA grant is different, how does it relate to the current proposal? The proposal is short on details on e.g. GIS procedures and software and on the metadata, making a thorough evaluation difficult. Inclusion of CVs in radically different formats (and with errors such as 9 duplicated publications on CV of Ellison) looks very unprofessional and does not bode well for this team's ability to take on the complex coordination of the large number of datasets and programs.

Additional Comments:

EXTERNAL REVIEWS: The external reviews differed in their evaluation of this project. The goals and objectives were

generally considered to be clear and consistent. Justification for the project was felt to be strong. It is very important to have integration of water-related data. It may be an overwhelming tasks though if too many informational systems have to be integrated. The approach was felt to be strong in general. One reviewer noted that it would make sense to develop (at least a prototype) manual prior to the first training workshop. The project was felt to be technically feasible, though coordination of the various tasks may be overwhelming. External review raised concerns about capabilities. The track record of authors in terms of past performance was hard to find in some of the personnel information provided. Other expertise may be needed in order to complete the project. Many details on this issue were provided by one of the external reviewers. The budget was considered to be reasonable in general, though there appeared to be inconsistencies in the details.

The integration of environmental monitoring data and making such integrated data available is very important for the efficient use of the monitoring data collected by various agencies and groups. While the relationship between BDAT, SWAMP and CERES is spelled out, it is unclear why there is a need for an augmented CEDEN. Is CEDEN just getting set-up (as indicated by the $750K region 9 EPA grant entitled "CEDEN EPA Exchange Network Grant" that is just getting underway) or is that a grant for another modification to CEDEN? (If so, that is not clear) If CEDEN is just getting underway, is it not premature to augment this program? If the EPA grant is different, how does it relate to the current proposal? The proposal is short on details on e.g. GIS procedures and software and on the metadata, making a thorough evaluation difficult. Inclusion of CVs in radically different formats (and with errors such as 9 duplicated publications on CV of Ellison) looks very unprofessional and does not bode well for this team's ability to take on the complex coordination of the large number of datasets and programs.

Technical Synthesis Panel (Discussion) Review

TSP Observations, Findings And Recommendations:

Augmentation of CEDEN

The panel felt that there were three major problems with the proposal:

1. There was not enough detail on the software or GIS procedures. 2. The need for expanding CEDEN at this time was insufficiently justified: it seems premature, although the training of watershed groups was considered worthwhile. 3. This was not considered a science project, but is really a management oriented project

The panel shared the concern of one external reviewer who felt that there were serious problems in the organization and documentation of the proposal that does not bode well for the successful completion of the project, which will require organization and documentation skills. The panel agreed with one external reviewer who stated that the project would benefit from additional hydrologic expertise.

Rating: adequate

Technical Review #1

proposal title: Augmentation of CEDEN

Review Form

Goals

Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the idea timely and important?

Comments	The goals of the project are clearly stated. The most important aspect of this project that it is very timely because the water issues are key to environmental sustainability. Water issues are spread among many disciplines and need multidisciplinary and cross-disciplinary approach. This project will help immensely, so scientists, engineers, managers and decision-makers could use data and information for multiple uses. The information will be very useful for system analysis dealing with multiple water issues as well for development of quantitative information systems in variety of disciplines.
Rating	excellent

Justification

Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full–scale implementation project justified?

Comments	With the technological revolution in information systems and symmetry of structural organization of atmospheric, hydrologic and geologic system it is absolutely critical to have integration of water related data. The organization of the data are fully justified also because the need of environmental sustainability and need of trade-off between

	development and ecosystems preservations. The only one concern is that too many informational systems must be integrated and sometimes such task becomes overwhelming, Still, this project is absolutely justified.
Rating	very good

Approach

Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Is the approach feasible? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology, or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision makers?

Comments	It is very well designed approach because it is taking into consideration the extreme complexity of data and information. Furthermore six principal elements are very well thought out. In particular, the sharing components take into account training, workshops and manual. The decision support system is highly valuable, particularly the web-based GIS application. This project will indeed generate a novel information and online tools for watershed monitoring with the goal of environmental sustainability, I hope. This project will also generate a novel so to speak library, because the many documents and studies will be available and ultimately useful to decision making. The project also will provide fare-share of funding because it will need the management and improvement of information.
Rating	excellent

Feasibility

Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success?

Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives and within the grasp of authors?

Comments	Yes, the project is fully documented and technically feasible. As proposed by authors the project is likely to be successful and consistent with objectives. The scale issue is not relevant here. One concern could be coordination, but as described in the proposal this issue will be taken care, I hope.
Rating	very good

Monitoring

If applicable, is monitoring appropriately designed (pre–post comparisons; treatment–control comparisons)? Are there plans to interpret monitoring data or otherwise develop information?

Comments	Generally is not applicable, but the process of integration of data and information are fully explained. Pilot project of data and information integration is fully justified, and will be implemented at the watershed levels.
Rating	excellent

Products

Are products of value likely from the project? Are contributions to larger data management systems relevant and considered? Are interpretive (or interpretable) outcomes likely from the project?

Comments	The products from these projects could be extremely valuable not only for California, but for others states as well. If this project is successful, which it should could serve as prototype for other states or even other countries. It is definite contribution to large data management system and GIS web-application is interpretable outcome with tremendous future for entire Earth System Sciences.
Rating	excellent

Additional Comments

Comments	Overall, this project is excellent. One concern is coordination of so many programs. However, this was fully explained in the proposal. So, if all components will be implemented this will be pilot project not only for California, but also for other states and countries. This project captures technological innovations, at the same time it is responding to system analysis of water issues. Another concern, I have not seen the goal of this endeavor to recognize the water and environmental sustainability. I hope the authors and project will highlight and recognize the balance between human and nature.

Capabilities

What is the track record of authors in terms of past performance? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Comments	The authors are qualified. The problem of coordination is addressed fully in this proposal and will be handled by Program Manager. The project has all components of the infrastructure and support to be successful. However, I believe the project needs highly qualified scientist who understand all aspects of water and its sustainability to guide the project through the symmetry of organization of atmospheric, hydrologic, ecological, geologic systems.
Rating	very good

Budget

Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Comments	Budget is reasonable and adequate.
Rating	very good

Overall

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating.

Comments	The project is very timely and need full support. The project takes into account the technological innovation and need for web-based GIS systems for decision support. The project could serve as prototype for other states and countries. One concern, however, is that no highly qualified hydrologist with broad understanding of water issues and its sustainability is not part of the team. Still the project should be supported with inclusion of hydrologist as a team member.
Rating	very good

Technical Review #2

proposal title: Augmentation of CEDEN

Review Form

Goals

Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the idea timely and important?

Comments	The goals are clear consistent. There are not hypotheses per se. The idea is crucial to a variety of other research efforts. This project has tremendous value added to existing and future projects.
Rating	excellent

Justification

Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full−scale implementation project justified?

Comments	This proposal will make excellent use of existing knowledge. The investigators are well positioned to take on this next phase of database development.
Rating	excellent

Approach

Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Is the approach feasible? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology, or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision makers?

Comments	If the proposal and project is successful, it will enable scores of scientists to perform the best

	possible policy-relevant research. The authors propose an extremely intelligent way to go about their business.
Rating	excellent

Feasibility

Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives and within the grasp of authors?

Comments	I would have like to read a bit more detail of the specific GIS procedures and software.
Rating	very good

Monitoring

If applicable, is monitoring appropriately designed (pre–post comparisons; treatment–control comparisons)? Are there plans to interpret monitoring data or otherwise develop information?

Comments	The strength of this proposal is that it will interpret and develop information. The project promises to make federally-compliant metadata. I would have liked to see a bit more detail on this aspect, because it is important (but admittedly not terribly exciting to describe in a proposal). Good metadata will allow the information to be truly useful.
Rating	excellent

Products

Are products of value likely from the project? Are contributions to larger data management systems relevant and considered? Are interpretive (or interpretable) outcomes likely from the project?

Comments	It has been my experience that much data exist in dispersed locations, and little of existing data is unified in an easily accessible

	`consistent form. This is the main limitation of`
	`most research scientists. This proposal promises`
	`to fix this most important problem.`

Rating	`excellent`

Additional Comments

Comments	`This proposal would allow other proposals to be`
	`successful. For example, researchers who`
	`propose to predict environmental changes with a`
	`GIS-based model would want to use the database`
	`that this proposal promises.`

Capabilities

What is the track record of authors in terms of past performance? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Comments	`The authors are very experienced and well-qualified.`
	`They have a good number of experienced computer`
	`professionals who know GIS and the Internet.`

Rating	`excellent`

Budget

Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Comments	`The budget is very detailed and organized. The amounts`
	`are very reasonable, given the potential use of the`
	`product.`

Rating	`excellent`

Overall

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating.

Comments	This is a high priority because it will allow other researchers to be more successful than they would otherwise be.
Rating	excellent

Technical Review #3

proposal title: Augmentation of CEDEN

Review Form

Goals

Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the idea timely and important?

Comments	Are the goals, objectives and hypothesis clearly stated and internally consistent? The goals (i.e., increase the amount and usefulness of data available to …, linking of additional fisheries, water quality and other environmental type data..) were clearly stated and internally consistent. Is the idea timely and important? The goals/idea of this proposal is definitely timely and important, including expansion of data base, data type, and sharing new and existing information with a wide-range of users. Goals Rating: 2 = Very Good: High quality in nearly all respects
Rating	very good

Justification

Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full–scale implementation project justified?

Comments	Justification: Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Yes, this study is justified relative to existing knowledge (e.g., EPA SORTET Database). Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Yes, six-principal elements clearly

	described the conceptual model and provided overview/background information as basis for the proposed work. Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified? Yes, the selection of demonstration project (i.e., training) is justified. However, I would create/develop the user's manual and training documentation prior to starting the actual training. It is critical to have a demo/prototype user's manual for the database before conducting the first training workshop to get first hand user's (i.e., the trainee's) feed back to enhance user's documentations. QA/QC has to be developed prior to implementing this training program. As a staring point, the project may benefit immensely from similar database QA/QC (i.e., STORET). From my own experience, database developers and managers need and must listen to users to make sure that the end-user's (the beneficiary) views are included. Goals Rating: 3 = Good: Good quality but some deficiencies.
Rating	poor

Approach

Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Is the approach feasible? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology, or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision makers?

Comments	Approach • The approach is well-designed and appropriate to meet the project's objectives, and adequately build upon existing databases/methods. • The proposed approach is feasible and I have several comments, which I included under the budget section. • The proposal also is likely to make a significant contribution, add and expand our knowledge-base, expand the use of information included in the database, and these contributions and expanded

	information will be useful to decision-makers. • Contributions from the proposed approach, and their significance, include: o Centralize, utilize and share existing, but scattered and inaccessible information to all users, knowledge base, and create a standardized method(s) to gather, analyze, and disseminate information to researchers, decision makers, and managers. o Expands on existing knowledge by connecting all field data into one shared database system, o Train (extend and share the knowledge) additional local/state/personal to apply the proposed approach (i.e., use consistent methods across local/state/regional/federal agencies), o Use results obtained to report on ecosystem response to restoration and documents progress in terms of native species recovery, protection and restoration. Goals Rating: 3 = Good: Good quality but some deficiencies.
Rating	good

Feasibility

Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives and within the grasp of authors?

Comments	Technical feasibility • The proposal described and documented the technical approach and its feasibility. With the exception of previous comment regarding when to start training and user's manual, along with other budget comments. • The proposed scale for this project, as described, is consistent with project objectives and would enable and benefit all local and state database users. • The likelihood of this project success depends on "who" is going to carry out this work. Information provided through this proposal does not warrant success for this project. As will be discussed later, personnel experience, the way information provided and presented in this proposal, as well as budget issues, caused a great deal of

	uncertainty regarding the success of this project. Goals Rating: 3 = Good: Good quality but some deficiencies.
Rating	good

Monitoring

If applicable, is monitoring appropriately designed (pre–post comparisons; treatment–control comparisons)? Are there plans to interpret monitoring data or otherwise develop information?

Comments	Monitoring: • Not Applicable.
Rating	poor

Products

Are products of value likely from the project? Are contributions to larger data management systems relevant and considered? Are interpretive (or interpretable) outcomes likely from the project?

Comments	Products: • It is likely that products from this project will be of value and will contribute not only to larger database, but the products also will be expanded and shared by a wide range of end-users and decision makers. • The proposed approach/project will lead to information that is useful to resource managers, other decision makers, and/or scientists. For example, the framework of the proposed approach is based on expanding on well-established locally and nationally adopted methodology. • Data, reports, and outcome of this project is well organized and accessible through easy to use web-enabled methods; All results will be retrievable on-line. • Data storage and dissemination is adequate and allow resource managers, other decision makers, and scientists to access and use project's results. Goals Rating: 2 = Very Good: High quality in nearly all respects.
Rating	

	`very good`

Additional Comments

Comments	`Additional Comments: The concept proposed for this proposal is great and must be considered for funding. However, evidence throughout the proposal indicated that very little effort went into developing the infrastructure and assembles the team to complete the proposed work.`

Capabilities

What is the track record of authors in terms of past performance? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

Comments	`Capabilities • Track record of authors in terms of past performance was not easily found from the information provided. Information provided through the "Personnel" section is lacking, un-organized, and incomplete. For example, ALL "qualifications" cell/row in the table provided are missing. To address this issue, I compared "Past Experience" from the resume section for what is required for a proposed Project Role. Results of my evaluation indicated that only a few proposed personnel had the right qualifications and matched their proposed role (i.e., Lara Pranger). In my evaluation I made an attempt to understand past experience of proposed personnel (from the resumes section) and compare past experience (found in resumes) with their project role (i.e., qualification column is blank in the table found in the personnel section). I'm uncertain if the combined qualifications of the assembled project team are adequate to complete this project. • The project team may be qualified to implement the proposed project. For example, the Table under personnel section listed ten team members and one sub-contractor (TBD) for this project. However, there were nine resumes included in this section`

representing the project team. I had too many questions regarding the information provided in these resumes, which make me un-easy and unsure that the assembled project can successfully complete this project. For example, there is a lead investigator (also called program manager) and there is a "Principal Investigator" also listed as "Principal Co-Investigator." I had several critical questions regarding the resume provided for the Program Manager/Lead investigator. For example, two sections describe current experience (April 2000 to Present and September 1999 to April 2000), which is identical! Furthermore, there is one year missing where past experience of the proposed Project Manager is missing: i.e., what happen between September 1998 and September 1999? And between July 1984 and November 1985? For the second resume (sub-contractor), the resumes described past experience in the future tense, even though the work was performed between 12/99 and 1/03. More importantly, I could not find any information regarding past experience (i.e., 1/03 to Present period) for the sub-contractor (i.e., second person listed in the personnel table). Both the Project Manager and second person proposed have no prior experience in IT or developing databases; I'm un-easy with the lack of such experience (mainly: biology, chemistry, and little GIS experience; no direct or hands-on experience in database development or IT) with key personnel for this project. • There are two proposed project managers (i.e., Karl Jacobs and Russell Fairy). Russell Fairy is also listed as a "Principal Investigator" and "Co-Principal Investigator." • The role for Ray McDowell is described in a Table (personnel section) but not defined in the budget section? Russell Fairy (i.e., Program Manager/Principal Investigator/Principal Co-Investigator) and Ray McDowell role in the "Tasks" section is not listed or defined? "Institutions performing which tasks and subtasks, as required for this proposal (page 1 in the "Tasks" section), none of the personnel involved or proposed were defined

	regarding which "institution" is performing the task. • The mix of disciplines among team members emphasis is placed on experience outside what is needed to complete this project. For example, at best two proposed personnel had past information technology (IT) experience, while most of the resumes emphasis is on biology, chemistry, GIS, and project management. There is definitely a need for more experienced IT personnel to be included to insure the success of this project as described. However, inconsistent format among resumes indicated, to me, that this proposal was prepared in haste. One of the resumes, a computer science/software development, listed all past experience without providing proper information (i.e., period of time at every project/company: Lizette Cook and Kris Lightsey) • With the exception of a few resumes, past experience and performance record of project team members showed little evidence of their abilities to complete work proposed under this project. Goals Rating: 4 = Fair: Lacking in one or more critical aspects.
Rating	fair

Budget

Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Comments	Budget • The labor section as presented has cost per task per participant and hours per task. • Two proposed personnel were not listed in this table (i.e., Ray McDowell and Russell Fairey). • Proposed amount is unrealistic and could not be derived for Task 1: I.1 Training of SRWP Subcontractor ($45/hr @ 1000 hours = $45,000). Under Task section (table 1 I.1) Lara Pranger time start month 1 and end month 2); assuming two months (8 weeks x 40 hr per week = 320 hours) this will cost = 320 hours x $45/hr = $14,400, not $45,000. • Training of SRWP regional coordinator subcontractor (TBD), which will be equipped to organize and train watershed groups. Why not have Lara

	Pranger take this responsibility, instead of training a sub-contractor @ $60/hr. Lara is in-house and has the expertise to do this training for regional manager, instead of training a sub-contractor (not retaining the expertise in house), which would leave at the end of project? • Task 1 – II.4 SRWP Website: Travel expenses, which is 900 miles @ $0.30 per mile and lodging for one night. A one way 450 mile trip for one night lodging and deriving back another 450 miles the next day is unrealistic and unsafe. • Task 1 – III.1 Integrate Data into CEDEN from Watersheds: Travel Expenses; Travel to SRWP &Watersheds Mileage participants 400 miles @ $0.31. This Task did not include "lodging" for the 400 miles. Also the re-imbursement charges are different and increased from $0.30 to $0.31 per mile. • All salaries cost were calculated on hourly basis. However, starting at Task 3.1 all salaries were based on "daily" (i.e., John Paul Ellison 1.8 days @ $61.92/hr). Furthermore, 1.8 days x 8 hours/day x $61.92 = $891.65, not $880. • Karl Jacobs: Proposal Program Manager/Lead Investigator, also Section Chief proposed budget salary is $42/hr, which is less than other staff salaries. Rating 4 = Fair: Lacking in one or more critical aspects.
Rating	fair

Overall

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating.

	Comments	Comments: Brief explanation of summary rating: • The concept proposed for this proposal is great and need to be considered as a top priority. However, evidence throughout the proposal do not guarantee that there were a lot of thoughts that went into developing the

	infrastructure and assemble highly qualified and experienced team members to complete this proposed work. Evidence throughout this document indicated that this proposal was prepared in haste (e.g., personnel proposed and have no defined role, resumes are incomplete and have different format, and most importantly do not reflect/describe past experience regarding the proposed role). • The goals/idea of this proposal is definitely timely and important, including expansion of data base, data type, and sharing new and existing information with a wide-range of users. • It is critical to have a demo/prototype user's manual for the database before conducting the first training workshop to get first hand user's (i.e., the trainees) feed back to enhance user's documentations. QA/QC has to be developed prior to implementing this training program. As a staring point, the project may benefit immensely from similar database QA/QC (i.e., STORET). • The proposed budget had too many issues that need to be clarified. Additional Comment: Any proposal needs to include a summary page to "spell" out all acronyms used in the text. Particularly for someone that is not familiar with all projects in CA. It would be very helpfull to provide reviewers with other "concepts/ideas" that are considered for funding to understand what one proposal (idea) is competing against other proposals, for funds.
Rating	good